

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The amendments set out above and the following remarks are believed responsive to the points raised by the Office Action dated May 9, 2007. In view of the amendments set out above and the following remarks, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Pending Claims

Claims 1 and 17-31 remain pending.

Claims 1, 17, 18, 22, 25 and 26 have been amended, to describe the invention more clearly. No new matter has been added, the basis for the amended claim language may be found within the original specification, claims and drawings.

Independent claims 1, 25, and 26 are supported at, for example, paragraph [0035]. Entry of the above is respectfully requested.

The Office Action

For convenience, the following remarks will address the rejections in the same order they were raised in the Office Action.

Claims 1, 17, 18, 22-26, 30, and 31 were rejected under 35 USC 102 as anticipated by DE Patent Publication No. 19717335 to Maurizio et al. (hereinafter referred to as "DE '335") [NOTE: while claim 1 was not specified in this section of the rejection, it appears this was a typographical error]; claims 19, 20, 27, and 28 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over DE '335, and claims 21 and 29 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over DE '335 in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0170769 to Kaszycki (hereinafter referred to as "Kaszycki").

Each of these rejections is separately and respectfully traversed.

In the device defined in amended independent claim 1, and the control mechanism defined in amended independent claims 25 and 26, the device and control mechanism include turbulence generators, wherein the turbulence generators are tapered. Additionally, the tapered turbulence generators are tapered on the side facing air flow in the device of claim 1 and the control mechanism of claim 25. Moreover, in the device of claim 1, the tapered

turbulence generators are in the overflowed outer edge area of the device. There is no disclosure in either DE '335 or Kaszycki of turbulence generators, and there is no disclosure in either of these documents of the turbulence generators in accordance with the presently claimed embodiments of the device and control mechanism. Accordingly, neither DE '335 nor Kaszycki can anticipate or suggest the device claimed in amended claim 1, or the control mechanism claimed in amended claims 25 and 26, and thus, the rejection cannot be maintained.

The device and control mechanism of the presently claimed invention are patentably distinct from that of DE '335 for the reasons set forth above. The fact that Kaszycki may teach an injection molded piece is of no import. Kaszycki simply does not cure the deficiencies of DE '335, and therefore, the combination also fails to render the present invention obvious.

Since the independent claims are allowable for the reasons set forth above, the dependent claims are allowable as they depend from the novel and non-obvious independent claims.

For the reasons set forth above, reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeremy M. Jay, Reg. No. 33,587

LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER

700 Thirteenth Street, N.W., Suite 300

Washington, DC 20005-3960

(202) 737-6770 (telephone)

(202) 737-6776 (facsimile)

Date: 6 Sept. 2007